

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House legislation providing for continued Government funding until midnight on Wednesday, October 14, the resolution be considered agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, and I am sure I won't. Let me check for just a moment.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I believe it has been cleared with the other side.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 4 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, with that, I will continue now and speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

EDUCATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, a great deal has been talked about here this afternoon as to what this Congress and our President will do on the issue of education. I am, once again, pleased to see our President engaged and spending time talking about education. He spent so much time skipping class and trying to avoid detention that he failed to learn about what Republicans and the majority here in Congress have been doing on behalf of education for the last good many months.

It is with that in mind that I would like to, for a few moments, talk about what we have done and what is being done. I am pleased that the President is once again engaged. We finally got his attention in the last week. He is staying in the White House and trying to work with us to resolve some of these issues. That is important. It is time that Congress adjourn, but most important, we must finish our work before we go.

The President did come home on occasion to veto a few bills this year, but he seems to have forgotten them. He seems to have forgotten the Coverdell A+ education bill that he vetoed, which would have provided educational savings accounts, would have allowed parents to set aside \$2,000 a year per child for educational expenses, and teacher testing and merit pay would reward teachers for their performance in the classroom. That was part of the bill that he vetoed. It also included dollars to the classroom, which would put money directly from the Federal Gov-

ernment into helping students instead of the bureaucrats. It is interesting that my colleagues on the other side, a few moments ago, introduced information about what GAO said. Let me tell you what the Federal Government said, what the Department of Education said about its own problems with paperwork and the burning up of valuable educational dollars. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that it takes approximately 48.6 million paperwork hours—the equivalent of almost 25,000 employees working 40 hours a week for a full year—to complete the paperwork involving the administration of the Federal education programs. The Senator from Washington spoke about the amount of time that local units of education use filling out the paperwork.

In my State of Idaho, as is true in Iowa, Ohio or any other State across the Nation, 50 percent of its paperwork burden is directly related to the 5 percent of the money that it gets. What happened? The President vetoed it. He came home, focused for a few moments, vetoed it, and left town again.

What about the tax regarding the College Tuition Program, encouraging parents to save for their child's college education? That, too, was vetoed by the President.

So when this President stands up and says, "I want billions of dollars more for education," what he is saying is, "I want billions of dollars more here in Washington to be run through a Federal system to be directed out for education," while this Senate voted, by a majority, to do quite the opposite—to literally turn the public loose to fund education without Federal strings.

Eighty-four percent of Federal elementary and secondary education funds are used for instruction, according to the April 1998 report by the U.S. Department of Education. What happened to the other percentage? Let's see. I guess that would be 16 percent. What happened? Overhead and administration. That is what it cost to get the money out.

You see, there is a game played in this town. It is how big you can build the agency and how many times you can roll the paper before you send the money out.

That is exactly what this Congress tried to avoid. That is exactly what we did avoid with legislation passed by this Senate and passed by the House and vetoed by this President.

Now that we are attempting to adjourn our Congress, just in the last few days the President is home back in school, not avoiding classes, and he is trying to spend, or spin his story about education.

Mr. President, why did you veto all of these productive pieces of legislation that were passed by a majority, a bipartisan majority, in Congress? Why did you veto legislation that, when polled, well over 60 percent of the American people said it gave more power to the family, to the parent, to the local education school board? That

is what America wants. They don't want 100,000 federally paid-for teachers and a bureaucracy to go along, and over 20 percent of the money staying right here to be spent on thousands and thousands of hours of paperwork.

I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky still has his 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair very kindly. I appreciate it very much.

RETIREMENT OF SENATE COLLEAGUES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, as the 105th Congress comes to a close, I want to take a moment to say thank you to my fellow colleagues who, like me, will be retiring this year.

I came to the Senate in 1974 with Senators GLENN and BUMPERS. It was a different time, when campaigns were still won by going door to door, when the Senate itself was much more open to compromise and bipartisanship.

Despite the changes in the Senate, Senator BUMPERS has continued to be a voice for his State, never giving up the fight for something in which he believed. And when the Senate itself began to listen, they began to respond. In fact, after fighting 19 years to reform the National Parks concessions operations, he finally won approval of the legislation on last Thursday.

And while it's true the Senate long ago lost its reputation as a place of eloquent debate, my colleague from Arkansas has proven time and again the power of words with his skillful oratory, whether the issue was arms control, education or balancing the budget. In all my years here in Washington, I was never so moved as I was by a speech he gave on preserving the Manassas, Virginia, Civil War Battlefield. He not only changed votes, but he reminded his colleagues and the American people that our greatest strength lies in our ability to give voice to our beliefs and to our constituent's concerns.

Like Mark Twain who came into this world with Halley's comet and left this world with the return, Senator GLENN came into the public eye with his historic orbit around the earth and he will close out his public career with another historic flight into space. In between, he's demonstrated over and over that he's truly made of the "right stuff."

As the "Almanac of American Politics" wrote, he is "the embodiment of the small town virtues of family, God-fearing religion, duty, patriotism and hard work . . .". And over the years, he has brought the same fight and determination that made him a brilliant fighter pilot to his efforts to expand educational opportunities, increase funding for scientific research, to clean up nuclear waste sites, promote civil rights and to make our government more efficient.

Despite their long list of contributions in the Senate, perhaps their greatest contributions to this nation are still to come. Senator BUMPERS has talked about going back to Arkansas to teach and Senator GLENN has said once he gets back down to earth, he'll work to steer young people toward public service. I can't think of a greater honor than to say I've served alongside these two men and shared their vision of a better America.

I also want to thank my two retiring colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We may not have always agreed on which road to take, but I believe we always shared a deep commitment to our country and its betterment. Whether you agree or not with Senator COATS' position on the issues, everyone in this chamber will agree he's willing to roll up his sleeves and do the hard work necessary to accomplish his goals. He's brought the same tenacity to the Senate that found him at three percent in the polls when he began his first congressional bid and had him winning by 58 percent on election day. He got that win the old-fashioned way, organizing block by block and pressing his case one-on-one.

Senator KEMPTHORNE has only been a part of this institution for just one term, but he has already proven that he can work with his colleagues to pass laws, like the unfunded mandates bill, in a place where it's often easier to move mountains than a piece of legislation. The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996 was a perfect example of his ability to bring together scientists, activists on both sides of the issue, and public health experts to craft legislation that each one had a stake in seeing succeed. So while he may have spent just a short while in these Halls, he demonstrated that it is only through compromise that we can achieve solutions in the best interest of the nation.

So Mr. President, let me tell my fellow retirees what a privilege it has been to serve with you over the years and how grateful I am for your commitment to public service and the American people.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I want to make a few brief remarks, share a few thoughts, and express my heart felt thanks to a number of individuals who have made my life in the Senate a little bit easier and a little bit more enjoyable than it otherwise would have been.

I have been privileged to serve in this body since December 28, 1974. As I look back, it is amazing how much progress we have made as a country during that period. The average life expectancy in this country has increased by 4 years. The average per capita income after adjusting for inflation, has risen 40 percent during this time period. The portion of adults with at least a high school diploma has risen from about two-thirds of adults to more than four-

fifths. The percentage of adults with at least a bachelor's degree has risen from 14 percent to 25 percent.

So we are living longer and healthier lives, we are wealthier, and we are better educated.

And the quality of life has improved in many other ways as well. We have an almost unlimited ability to communicate. The developments with computers in recent years have been almost breathtaking. Children understand computers at an early age—often before they even start school. The percentage of homes with computers keeps rising. We have cell phones and laptops and cable TV and satellite dishes and fax machines. Our access to information is better and faster than ever.

We have opportunities to travel more, live in bigger homes, and eat more nutritious meals. We spend more on entertainment than ever.

But Mr. President, our challenges are probably greater than ever.

I entered the Senate at the beginning of a period of deep cynicism and distrust of government, having just come through the Vietnam war and Watergate. We have always had a very healthy distrust of government in this country, but 1974 was an especially troublesome time. And I have witnessed a fascinating national debate on the role of government during the period since. The cynicism from Watergate evolved into a crisis of confidence in our country, and a growing feeling by some through the 1980's that government was the major source of many problems in our society, not the solution.

But the debate of the role of government has continued to evolve. I think we are at the point today where there is a fairly broad consensus among Americans about certain aspects of government.

There is a consensus about certain things that Americans want from their government—a strong defense, the best educational system in the world, managing the economy in an efficient way, including balanced budgets, low inflation, low interest rates, low unemployment, and the least amount of taxation and regulation possible. Americans want fair rules in the workplace and the marketplace, from family leave to fair trade to basic consumer protection. They want an adequate infrastructure to sustain a successful and growing economy. And they expect minimal safety and health protections, from law enforcement to food and drug safety to providing health care for the elderly and the poor.

I have found that almost all of my colleagues want these things as well. We often differ on the best approach, or the best philosophy, for meeting these goals and providing what our constituents want, but we are all basically after the same things.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of aisle still use the rhetoric from the 1980's about being for lower taxes and smaller government. Who could be

against that? But most of these same colleagues are also for all of the things I just mentioned. They would agree with me that these are all things that our constituents demand and expect us to address. We all want the smallest government possible, but we want government to deliver on all of these things. So it is a challenge for all of us.

And the future challenges for the next Congress and beyond will be even more complex. I mentioned earlier that we are living longer. The standard retirement age has not gone up since I came to the Senate. In fact, the average private sector retirement age has gone down. But we live longer. The percentage of the population age 65 and older is up to about 13 percent today, and is projected to continue to grow. During my tenure in the Senate, I have seen federal spending on Social Security grow from \$64 to \$380 billion. I have seen Medicare spending increase from \$13 to \$220 billion. And roughly half of Medicaid spending, which has gone from \$7 to \$100 billion in the budget, is attributable to nursing home care. These three areas alone—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—have gone from about 25 percent of the total budget to roughly 42 percent of the total budget. Without question, the major budget issue in the next few years is how we deal with the costs associated with the elderly.

And it is a quality issue as well. Many of the same trends which are currently affecting managed care in the private sector will certainly affect the quality of medical care received by the elderly. I wish we had made more progress in these areas before my time in the Senate expired. I wish my colleagues well in addressing these issues and urge them to do so earlier rather than later. I know many colleagues share my sentiments.

The other area I would urge my colleagues to address is the financing and operation of campaigns. Here is an area that has changed dramatically during my 24 years. When I announced my retirement from the Senate, I mentioned the two "M's,"—Money and Meanness—as major reasons why I chose not to run again. Now that we are in the midst of the current campaign season, I believe even stronger about this issue. As reported in the newspaper yesterday, PACs have collected almost \$360 million in the last 18 months. We all like to say that the money does not influence how we vote and how we think, but, truthfully, it is a matter of degree. There needs to be a stronger ethic of avoiding even the appearance of a conflict of interest. We need more of that in politics—much more of it. Senators who solicit campaign contributions and then within a very short period of time are casting votes and making decisions on matters which greatly affect both the contributors and the Senator's constituents place themselves in very difficult situations. It goes to the heart of our system of Democracy, and whether it works or